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1. Confessing to a crime you didn’t commit in order to avoid punishment is wise.

Now, the simple more innate answer to this question would be “Well this is stupid of course not, why the hell would I confess to something I didn’t even do? if I’m truly innocent I won’t be in any trouble” However, there’s a more obvious, although selfish response the “Hell yeah if I’m not getting punished, and I’m leaving squeaky clean with no chances of suffering consequences then why not?” this comes from our deep rooted animalistic instincts to protect ourselves, and our “cubs” so to speak, the “every man for himself” good old American spirit. After all, why should an innocent person not only commit to something they didn’t do but pay the price for it as well? Because let’s face it, if you’re lying about committing a crime it doesn’t take a poorly written detective film to figure out you didn’t commit it, just some basic forensics and elbow grease. Looking at this question the natural response is to say no, the good in us wants to say no, but we do know questions (or well thought out questions at least), cannot be a simple yes or no answer, they require something more. Like ham is paired with cheese, any psychologically mind boggling question that puts our morals at stake is best paired with situational ethics. In order to fully respond to this question, one must know the circumstances. How bad is the crime I’d be committing to? Because let’s face it god knows you can’t just commit to any old crime, god no, you have morals for Christ’s sake. So let’s think back for a moment, using our imagination and situational ethics, back to 1692 a time of devil worshippers and incantations, a time where witches were believed to be walking among the living. At the time we must understand that religious fervor was high, and the average person blamed everyday calamities on supernatural beings; if a child died at birth it was Satan, if the crops died the underworld was sending them a message. Now because of so many religious superstitions over time it was common belief that there were witches who were casting spells on people. At the time this was considered to be one of the most heinous crimes a person could commit, if you were found guilty of such a thing chances are you’d either be sentenced to death or burnt at the stake, and if you somehow lived then let’s not mention a lifetime of public isolation. Now, that was unless you could provide people with more detailed information on how you came to be a witch. If you could prove to the police that someone else put you up to it (which at the time it was just a basic he said she said) and they cast a spell on you then that’s it you were free, almost as if nothing happened. Of course there were no real witches at the time but if you have a group of people telling you you’ve caused someone to be deathly sick and they can’t even stand the sight of you without fainting. Then your mind begins to play games on you and you start to really think you’re a witch or something of the kind nonetheless. In 1692 when people were as ignorant as a Mormon republican convention, I do somewhat to an extent believe this was the best choice to make, not the wisest but if you wanted to survive then it was the best. The wiser choice to me in any situation would be to say you didn’t commit the crime, because if you didn’t commit it at all then there would be no punishment? But unfortunately, the fact is detective work was not at its peak so in order to gather evidence you had to do so from word of mouth, which as we know is not the most reliable source because people can be filled with hot blooded emotions and bias. So the wisest choice was to self incriminate yourself, and rat some other innocent person out to take the spotlight off you. Not one of America’s most glorious moments.